

E433

.W53

Copy 1



The Federal Union.---It must be Preserved.

NUMBER ONE.

BY GEORGE M. WESTON.

THERE will be found appended, extracts from speeches made in Congress during the present session down to the present date (April 26, 1856) by Southern members, in which is avowed the purpose, in certain contingencies, of dissolving the Union and overturning the existing Federal Government.

To enable those who may choose to do so, to verify either the literal accuracy of these extracts, or their fairness as exhibiting the scope and purpose of the gentlemen quoted, reference is made to the pages of the Congressional Globe and Appendix in which the speeches may be found, excepting those of Messrs. Keitt and Shorter, which (as yet) have appeared only in the Daily Globe.

Quotations are only made from those speeches, in which the purpose of dissolving the Union in certain contingencies is avowed directly and without circumlocution. To have extended the range of quotation, so as to have embraced all the speeches of Southern members, in which the same threat is contained only inferentially but not less unmistakably, would have protracted this article to an unreasonable length.

Such an extension of the range of quotation would have included nearly all the Southern gentlemen who have spoken during the present session of Congress.

It will appear remarkable that gentlemen, thus in the daily habit of threatening a dissolution of the Union, should assume to be the only "*sound*," the only "*conservative*," the only "*National*," and even the only "*Union*" men in the country, and should have made it an especial objection to the election of Mr. Banks to the Speakership, that he said, or is reported to have said on the stump, that under certain circumstances he was willing "*to let the Union slide*."

It is not less remarkable that these same gentlemen attempt to fix the charge of "*disunion*," upon parties at the North, who not only constantly disavow such a sentiment, but many of whom do, with Mr. Giddings of Ohio, avow their fixed purpose to uphold the Government and put down Southern nullification, if need be, by force of arms.

Majority interests and majority parties may be guilty of tyranny and oppression. To charge them with those offences may be just, or unjust, but cannot be absurd. The political power of this country rests with the free States, and they can suffer no wrongs in the Union, or under the Union, but with their own acquiescence. Revolt, rebellion, nullification, secession; these are the resorts and remedies of minorities. The free States can have no motive to leave a Union, which they have the assured power to control. It is a palpable absurdity to charge them with any such purpose.

The deliberate declarations of Southern Senators and Representatives, that they will overthrow the Union, in various contingencies, but especially unless they can enjoy the unrestricted right of carrying slaves and slavery into all the Territories of the United States, present matter of grave consideration.

If those declarations are made in good faith, and if the attempt will be made to carry them into effect, the country should understand it and deliberate upon it.

If on the contrary, these declarations are made merely for effect, to overawe Northern members of Congress, and to intimidate the people of the North, the country should understand this also, and deliberate upon it.

It may be doubtful whether the sixteen millions of people who inhabit the free States,

powerful in numbers, skill, intelligence and wealth, inferior to no race in courage and aptitude for war, commanding the seas, and occupying wide and fertile domains in the zone most favorable to human development, will submit with patience to this experiment of intimidation.

Louis XIV came down into the French Parliament, and, striking his boots with his horse-whip, commanded the registry of his decrees. The same thing, allowing for differences of times and manners, is done almost daily at the National Capitol, by the representatives of a peculiar species of property.

To a certain extent, perhaps, but only to a certain extent, the free States may be reconciled to the humiliation, by the consciousness that they have brought it upon themselves, by submission to similar humiliations heretofore.

The gentlemen who threaten the overthrow of the Union, do not represent the rights, or interests, and perhaps not the feelings, of the South. Those who tremble at the slightest whisper of a war with England, should not desire civil convulsion. Abolitionism existed before the Union and will survive its downfall, and would then act with unchecked and augmented energy. The disciples of Mr. Garrison, look upon the Union as their greatest obstacle, as it unquestionably is. It is not certain that a violent dissolution of the Union would leave to slavery any part of the Territories. Whoever remits his claims to the sharp and summary arbitrament of the sword, takes the hazards of the die. The great baronial proprietors, who are the real masters of the South, will act coolly and warily and wisely, and will interpose to restrain an exasperation, fomented for their benefit, before it reaches a point beyond their control.

The gentlemen who threaten the overthrow of the Union, represent nothing, in truth, but the fruits of that **TERRORISM**, which has put down free discussion at the South, silenced the best men of the South, and delivered it over helpless to the leadership of the most violent and the most unworthy characters. The Nebraska Act would have been defeated by the votes of Southerners, if there had been A NORTH upon whose alliance they could have depended. It is because there has been NO NORTH, that the South has been given up to demagogues, whose only rivalry has been in ministering to mischievous excitement. In no part of the country is the Republican party looked to with more anxious hope, than at the South. The triumph of the Republican party

at the North, would be followed by the formation of a Union party at the South. What is needed is something strong and firm to lean upon, such as the Union men of 1832 found in the iron will of JACKSON. Although no representative in Congress from that section *dares now to give utterance to it*, the sentiment of National patriotism is not extinct at the South.

A vigorous rally at the North at this crisis, will crush out the whole race of politicians who now assume to speak for the South, and cover them with the same odium, *which followed the plotters of the Hartford Convention to their graves*. These politicians see their possible fate, and are now trembling with mingled rage and fear.

Splendid prizes of national regard and of patriotic ambition await the men at the South, who have the discernment and courage to see the right path and walk in it. Upon that theatre will be enacted over again the same struggle, which aroused the energies of the Chandlers, and Holmeses and Woodburys of New England, in the dark days of the embargo and the war of 1812. We are now only in the third generation from the contest which gave us national being. The traitors and nullifiers who are plotting the overthrow of the Union, are attempting their work prematurely. We are too near the times of the founders of the Republic. The Farewell Address of Washington is too fresh in the memories of his countrymen. The words of Jackson still ring in our ears:—**THE FEDERAL UNION. IT MUST BE PRESERVED.**

South Carolina nullification, although installed in high places, will be crushed yet again, and this time fatally as well as ignominiously.

Most suicidal would it be at this crisis, to entrust men with the high places of the Government, *who are not well affected towards it*. The command of the ship must not be given to those whose fidelity is suspicious. The **UNION TEST** must be applied to all candidates for the Presidency. Every aspirant for that position, must be made to declare explicitly and without qualification, that in any event and under all circumstances, he will at all hazards and with all his official power, uphold the Union and its laws. If any candidate refuses to subscribe to this test, it will be proof conclusive that he is in collusion with Southern traitors. Especially should this test be applied to the candidate of the Cincinnati Convention, because from that Convention we have most reason to fear the nomination of a man, to be designated by, and who will be under the influence of, the hatchers of the identical treason, which it will be the first duty of the President of the United States to repress.

EXTRACTS FROM THE FAREWELL ADDRESS
OF WASHINGTON.

"The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. * *

* But as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your NATIONAL UNION to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a CORDIAL, HABITUAL and IMMOVABLE attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to THINK AND SPEAK OF IT as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, IN ANY EVENT, be abandoned; INDIGNANTLY FROWNING upon the FIRST DAWNING of any attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the SACRED TIES which now link together the various parts."

EXTRACTS FROM THE SPEECHES OF SOUTHERN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

In the House, Dec. 13, [App. to Cong. Globe, page 47.] Mr. WALKER of Ala., said:—

"After all, it is not the Union—the Union alone, upon which the reflecting man of this country bases his hopes and rests his affections. With him the Union is secondary in importance to the principles it was designed to perpetuate and establish."

In the House, Dec. 22, [App. to Cong. Globe, page 48.] Mr. BENNETT of Mississippi, said:—

"Now, sir, what is the first proposition of submission endorsed by the South in the Philadelphia platform? It is, sir, that the Union of these States is the paramount political good. What is a paramount political good? It is a good above all others; a good above the preservation of the Constitution, above the sovereignty of the States, above the protection of the institutions of the South. This, sir, is the first step of submission. * * * The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Banks] * * * stated, that at the time of the agitation in the Congress of the United States in reference to the Kansas Nebraska bill, he was opposed to that measure, and that he is now in favor of a restoration of the Missouri Compromise, and opposed to the extension of slavery, not only into Kansas, but into any of the Territories. * * * The great question agitated in the public mind, is the question of slavery extension, and the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territories. The Abolition party claim everywhere the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the Territories. * * * We would scorn, sir, as southern people, to present ourselves as suppliants at the feet of Abolitionists, and claiming mercy at their hands. * * * I come in the name of my people, not with threats, but with warnings. If you love the Union, by the high obligations which that sentiment imposes on you, we warn you to preserve it. * * * Sir, it was in 1851 that this aggressive spirit on the part of the North

caused the people of my State to meet in Convention; and in that Convention the Union party of the State declared that there were aggressions by the North that would amount to *intolerable oppression*, and would eventually sever the ties that bind us together, and DISSOLVE THE UNION; and that, contemplating the possible repeal of the fugitive slave bill, a modification of the same, OR refusal to execute its provisions, the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, OR the refusal to admit a new State into the Union because of its having a pro-slavery constitution—in the efforts to meet these evils the Union of the States must be considered the secondary political good. Upon this platform, which I thought, in 1851, yielded up everything that could be fairly demanded, I hope now to be permitted to stand; and I warn the Republican party in this House, that they come here elected to do now the very things which the Union party, in 1851, said could not be done except AT THE PRICE OF THE SEVERANCE OF THE UNION. * * * I am prepared to say, the South will NEVER SUBMIT to the consummation of those acts which in your election you are bound to carry out. *

* * * If that conflict must come, I for one say, LET IT COMMENCE IN THIS HALL; and I hope sir, that if it be necessary to maintain our constitutional rights, it may commence on this floor, and that the first drop of HUMAN GORE shed in defence of violated rights and insulted honor, may CRIMSON THE WALLS OF THIS CAPITOL."

In the House, Dec. 20, [App. to Cong. Globe, page 30.] Mr. COX of Kentucky, said:—

"I make bold to say that the position assumed by them [the Democrats,] and that occupied by us [the Southern Americans] upon this great question, is the only position that we as national men, can occupy consistently with the peace, THE SAFETY, the harmony, the welfare and prosperity of the whole Union. * * * If they don't like to be called Abolitionists, I will call them Black Republicans, Republicans, whichever they prefer. I will call them the Anti-Nebraska party—the party which intends to agitate the question of slavery in Congress and out of it, at THE HAZARD OF EVERYTHING that is held sacred in this Union. *

* * * A gentleman near me says, that they have not said a word yet about the restoration of the Missouri Compromise. Well, they have given one hundred and six votes in this House, and the restoration of the Missouri Compromise is the basis of the union of those one hundred and six members. * * * When you tell me that you intend to put a restriction on the Territories, I say to you that upon that subject the South is a unit, and WILL NOT SUBMIT TO ANY SUCH THING. You do not understand that, or you would not press it so pertinaciously."

On the 19th of December, in the House, [Cong. Globe, page 56,] Mr. CAMPBELL of Kentucky, said:—

"We are led to believe that they [the Republican party] are ready to push matters to a length which must ultimately lead to a DISSOLUTION OF THIS UNION."

Upon being interrogated by Mr. Stanton, as to the proofs upon which this charge was made, Mr. Campbell read the following, which he stated to be a resolution adopted by a convention at Cincinnati:—

“That the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was an infraction of the plighted faith of the nation, and that it should be restored; and if efforts to that end should fail, Congress should refuse to admit into the Union any State tolerating slavery, which shall be formed out of any portion of the Territory from which that institution was excluded by that compromise.”

Having read this resolution, Mr. Campbell proceeded to speak as follows:

“My remarks were based on *that resolution*. It is an interference with our institutions when our citizens are denied the same rights in the new Territories with the citizens from the North; for that Territory belongs to us as much as it does to you. * * * * We regard this Confederacy as *secondary in importance*, and when a Government falters in carrying out its guarantees for the protection of life, liberty and property, it is no longer entitled to the fealty of its citizens. And in addition to that, I will avow this sentiment, believing that it will be endorsed by my constituency, that whenever this Government makes a distinction between a Southern and a Northern constituency or citizenship, then *we shall no longer consider ourselves bound to support the Confederacy*, but **WILL RESORT TO THE RIGHT OF REVOLUTION**, which is recognized by all.”

On the 20th of December, in the House, [Cong. Globe, page 61,] Mr. McMULLIN of Va., said:—

“Let me tell that member [Mr. Giddings] and this House and the country, that should this country ever arrive at that unfortunate state of affairs that the Government should pass into the hands of the North—of such a Northern fanatical character over the way, and that that Government should **RESTORE THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE**, or repeal the fugitive slave law, then in such a case I would have to indorse the declaration of the honorable gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. Campbell:] that is to say, that **THIS UNION MUST AND WILL BE DISSOLVED**. * * * * One of the greatest misfortunes of the country, Mr. Clerk, is the fact that our northern brethren mistake the character of the South. They suppose that the Southern disunionists are confined to the Calhoun wing of the Democratic party. This, sir, is the **GREATEST ERROR** that the people of the North have ever fallen into. And I tell you, sir, and I want the country to know it—I want the gentlemen from the free States, our Republicans, our Seward Republicans, our Abolitionists, or whatever else they may be called, to know it—that if you *restore the Missouri Compromise, OR repeal the fugitive slave law, THIS UNION WILL BE DISSOLVED*.”

Mr. McMullin then proceeded to say that he made these declarations “in the hearing of the whole southern delegation—Whig, Democrat and

Southern American;” and he then added the following words:—

“I HOPE THAT IF ANY GENTLEMAN DEEMS I DO NOT PROPERLY REPRESENT THE STATE OF PUBLIC FEELING IN THE SOUTH, HE WILL CORRECT ME.”

Neither on that day, or any succeeding day, did any Southern member rise to disclaim the sentiments imputed to the South by Mr. McMullin, although thus expressly called upon by him to do so, if he had misstated Southern views.

Mr. McMullin has been four times elected to Congress from Virginia. He has during the present month (April,) in an elaborate printed address to his constituents, reiterated the above views.

In the House, on the 24th of December, Gov. Smith of Virginia and others, renewed the lamentations which had been made on previous days, over the expression imputed to Mr. Banks, that under certain circumstances he would “*let the Union slide*.” At length Mr. BROOKS of South Carolina arose and said: [Cong. Globe, page 77.]

“The gentleman from Massachusetts has announced to the world, that in certain contingencies, he is willing to “*let the Union slide*.” Now, sir, let his contingencies be reversed, and I am also willing to “*let the Union slide*”—ay, sir, to **AID IN MAKING IT SLIDE**. * * * I hesitate not to say, that if his construction of the constitutional power of Congress over the Territories shall prevail in this country, I for one heartily indorse the sentiment.”

In the House, on the 23rd of December, Mr. SEWARD of Georgia, offered a resolve in relation to the organization of the House, [Cong. Globe, page 95,] affirming in substance, that all in favor of the doctrine of non-intervention in the Territories, ought to unite on a common candidate for the Speakership. He insisted that it was vital, that Congress should not interfere with slavery in the Territories. Among other things, he said:—

“If the question is to be settled by Congress, and decided against the South by a majority from the North, the Government will be endangered and **THE UNION CANNOT BE PERPETUATED**.”

In the House, on the 4th of January, Mr. BOYCE of South Carolina, [Cong. Globe, page 143,] said:—

“I have thought, and I still think, and I have expressed the opinion, and I still express the opinion, that there are circumstances which are hurrying us **ALMOST IRRESISTIBLY TO A DISRUPTION**. * * * * I have seen at the North the formation of a great party, based upon the single idea of hostility to the institutions of the South. The only question with me, then, as to the continuance of the Union, is, whether that party will take possession of the

North? If they do, in my opinion THE UNION IS AT AN END. * * * * * What is that party pledged to? The great boasting idea of that party is, that freedom is national and slavery is sectional. That party, then, are obliged, if they come into power, as is recommended in the resolutions of the State of Maine presented to the Senate yesterday, to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and to prohibit it in all the Territories, arsenals and dock-yards in the United States. Well, then, it seems to me that if that party comes into power pledged to those measures, we shall be in the midst of chaos and anarchy and revolution."

Mr. Boyce, it will be observed, does not charge the "great party" being formed at the North, with any design to interfere with slavery in the States. He treats his opponents fairly, and only imputes to them the sentiment and purpose which they actually cherish; viz: that freedom ought to be and shall be national and slavery sectional. Rather than submit to the enforcement of such a sentiment and such a purpose, the South, according to Mr. Boyce, will bring on "CHAOS AND ANARCHY AND REVOLUTION."

Mr. Boyce then proceeds to set out another event, in his judgment likely to happen, and which also, in his judgment will dissolve the Union: viz: that the North will avail itself of its numerical strength to get possession of the patronage of the national government. He says:—

"This great sectional party at the North goes upon the idea that, by uniting together at the North they can obtain the control of this Government and dispense its vast patronage among themselves, and reduce the people of the South to a secondary and subordinate condition. * * * That party which places itself upon the position of giving power to the North, will eventually succeed; and when that party does succeed, in my opinion THE UNION WILL BE AT AN END."

In other words, if the North with more than two-thirds of the free people and a still greater disproportion of the wealth of the country, presume to dispute the prescriptive right of the South to control the government and enjoy its patronage, THE UNION WILL BE AT AN END.

In the House, January 9, Mr. TALBOT of Kentucky, [Cong. Globe, page 176,] said:—

"What was the aspect of political parties when we first met at this Capitol? The Republican party had met at the North and organized themselves into a sectional Free Soil Abolition party, determined, many of them, upon a repeal of the fugitive slave law, and all of them upon the repeal of the Kansas Nebraska bill; the restoration of the Missouri restrictive line; the restriction of slavery in the Territories; the non-admission of any more slave States into this Union. This party, Mr. Clerk, promised no good to the coun-

try, but, by its system of political warfare, threatened a DISRUPTION OF THE UNION.

What else, sir? The great American party, * * * a few days before we met here, held a meeting at Cincinnati, nine States being represented, and they, too, adopted a platform, threatening the insubinations of the South, though it MIGHT COST THIS GLORIOUS UNION to carry out their principles."

The platform of the American party here referred to, was the resolution quoted by Mr. Campbell of Kentucky on the 19th of December. I copy that resolution again:—

"That the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was an infraction of the pledged faith of the nation, and that it should be restored; and if efforts to that end should fail, Congress should refuse to admit into the Union any State tolerating slavery, which, shall be formed out of any portion of the Territory from which that institution was excluded by that compromise."

This is the "platform threatening the institutions of the South" which Mr. Talbot denounces. It is of this "platform" that he affirms, that an attempt to carry out its principles, MIGHT COST THIS GLORIOUS UNION.

In the House, January 11, Mr. DOWDELL of Alabama, [Cong. Globe, page 217,] said:—

"I make free to declare my opinion, not by way of threatening, but, I trust, as a patriot, who desires the best interests of his country, that if the gentlemen who are in a majority in this House fairly represent the section of the Union from which they come—if they are the types of Northern majorities, and the principle which I understand them to profess shall become the settled opinions of controlling majorities in the Northern States, and shall be attempted to be made law in this country, through the forms of Federal Legislation, then the continued Union of the States will be AN IMPOSSIBILITY, or if possible, THE GREATEST CURSE which could be inflicted upon any people."

And again in the same speech, in reference to the party which he denominated "Black Republican," Mr. DOWDELL said:—

"Sectional and fanatic, it is bent upon the destruction of the rights of a whole section. It threatens to do that which cannot be done without being followed by A SPEEDY DISSOLUTION OF THESE STATES."

No other "principles" having been "professed" on the floor of the House by the Republican members, except these, that Congress has power over the subject of slavery in the Territories, and that this power ought to be exercised in favor of freedom: it is easy to understand in what contingency Mr. Dowdell would regard the Union, either as an IMPOSSIBILITY, or as a CURSE. Indeed, Mr. DOWDELL himself takes pains to prevent any possible ambiguity, and defines exactly the particulars in which the "Black Republicans" are "sectional" and "fanatic." The principle of Congressional non-

intervention in the Territories, affirmed in the Kansas-Nebraska bill, is, he insists, "*the great and leading question*" of the times, and of this question, he says:—

"It will decide, in my humble opinion, the destiny of this country. Sir, *upon this great and leading question*, the gentlemen comprising what is called the Republican party, have taken position *sectional in character and aggressive towards the South.*"

In the House, January 11, Mr. STEWART of Maryland, [Cong. Globe, page 220,] after denouncing the North as having attempted in 1820 to deprive Missouri of her constitutional rights, "*in a spirit of aggression and propagandism,*" proceeded to say:—

"It had to be disposed of, and now again must be met. The question of the admission of a new State from the Territory in dispute will soon be presented. * * * * * Minor questions, however important otherwise, must be subordinate to this great national exigency which involves in its settlement possibly **THE DESTINIES OF THIS GLORIOUS UNION.**"

In the House, January 30, Mr. BOYCE of South Carolina, [Cong. Globe, page 320,] said:—

"I look upon the election of Mr. Banks as one of the greatest misfortunes that could happen to this country. * * * * * I look upon his principles, if carried as **DEATH** to the Constitution and **TO THE UNION.** The result of his principles, if carried out, would be **INEVITABLY REVOLUTION.** * * * * * For my own part, whenever that question is put to me—to-day, to-morrow, next week, or next year, if it be anarchy, or the extreme anti-slavery opinions of Mr. Banks, I shall say, **ANARCHY FOREVER.**"

In the House, January 19, Mr. BOCOCK of Virginia, addressing himself to the Republicans, [Cong. Globe, page 264,] said:—

"You cheat yourselves with the delusion that your platform makes you national. You declare war on the institution of slavery wherever the strong arm of this Government can reach it, and call that a *national* platform. To justify so absurd a position, you love to employ the specious phrase that "*freedom is national and slavery sectional.*" I tell gentlemen that it is a cheat and delusion. * * * * * When in your platform you come forward and say that your institutions alone are entitled to the protection of the government, and that ours are to be *discountenanced and restricted by its action*, then you lay down a sectional platform and array yourselves into a sectional party. You put us beyond the pale of the Constitution, and you force us to fight you by every fair and honorable means; and **WE SHALL DO IT.**"

Mr. Giddings and others. Agreed!

Mr. Bocock. Rest assured that **WE WILL DO IT.**"

In the Senate, March 5, [Cong. Globe, page 554,] Judge BUTLER of South Carolina, said:—

* * * "I have such confidence in the good sense of the people of this country, that I believe Republican institutions might survive the present Union. Really it is broken already. * * * I would rather that it should be **DIS-SOLVED TO-MORROW**—I wish my words measured—in preference to living in a Union without the protection of a Constitution which gives me an equality. I should tell my people so to-morrow."

In the Senate, on the 27th of March, [Cong. Globe, page 758,] the foregoing remarks of Judge Butler being made a subject of comment, he said:—

"I say now, calmly, that when a Northern majority shall acquire such a control over the legislation of this country as to disfranchise the slave holding States in any respect in which they have an equality under the Constitution of the country, I will not agree to live under this Government, when the Union can survive the Constitution. * * * All that I have contended for, is, that the common domain of this Government, acquired by the common blood and treasure of all parts of the United States, shall be just as free to one class of citizens as another. * * * But, sir, if an insulting interference were to be made by a majority of Congress, or such an interference as would exclude a slaveholder on the broad ground that he was unworthy of equality with a non-slaveholding population, do you suppose I would stay in the Union if I could get out of it?"

In the House, January 17, [App. to Cong. Globe, page 60,] Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia, said:—

"I was willing to divide as an alternative only, but a majority of the North would not consent to it; and now we have got the great principle, established in 1850, carried out in the Kansas-Nebraska bill, that Congress, **AFTER REMOVING ALL OBSTRUCTIONS, is not to intervene against us.** This is the old Southern Republican principle, attained after a hard and protracted struggle in 1850, and I say, if Congress ever again exercises the power to exclude the South from an equal participation in the common Territories, I, as a southern man, **AM FOR RESISTING IT.** The gentleman from Tennessee does not say *what he would do* in that contingency."

In the Senate, Feb. 25, [App. to Cong. Globe, page 95,] Mr. JONES of Tennessee, said:—

"We have a question before us and the country which I think of far more importance to our interest and honor, and *to the perpetuity of our institutions*, than the question whether or not Mr. Crampton shall be withdrawn. * * *

* * * The beginning of the difficulties may be found in an earnest, ardent, and—pardon me for saying—a **RECKLESS** determination to repeal that clause of the Kansas-Nebraska bill which abrogates the Missouri restriction. * * * * * We ask nothing but what the Constitution guarantees to us. That much we do ask. That much **WE WILL HAVE.** I do not wish to be excited about this matter. We do not mean to be driven from our propriety; but there is a

fixed, immutable, universal determination on the part of the South NEVER TO BE DRIVEN A SINGLE INCH FURTHER. * * * If we are not to enjoy our rights under the Constitution, tell us so; and if we may, LET US SEPARATE peaceably and decently. * * * I tell you in every hand there will be a knife, and there will be war to the knife AND THE KNIFE TO THE HILT."

In the House, March 13, [App. to Cong. Globe, page 153,] Mr. TAYLOR of Louisiana, said:—

"If the counsels of these men [the Republicans] find favor with us, a few short weeks, or months may be sufficient to fill a land where it has been all sunshine, with "clouds and darkness;" and amid the surrounding gloom such contentions and conflicts may arise, in which section may be arrayed against section, State against State, and perhaps man against man, in DEADLY STRIFE, as would make all men * * * shudder with fear."

In the House, March 13, [App. to Cong. Globe, page 230,] Mr. LETCHER of Virginia, said:—

"So far as the South are concerned, sir, I will tell you now what I have no doubt will be the fact—what I believe firmly and conscientiously, that if you [the Republicans] should have power here, and undertake to pass measures to carry out the principles which you profess, you would find that we had spirit enough to SEPARATE FROM YOU, and make the effort, at least, to take care of ourselves.

A VOICE. What measures?

Mr. LETCHER. If you undertake to repeal the fugitive slave law, and deprive us of the means of recovering our property when it is stolen from us, * * * If you undertake to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia and prohibit it in the Territories of the United States by Congressional legislation. * * * You will find that the South, if it has a particle of self respect—and I know that it has—will be prepared to resist ANY, and all, such measures."

In the House, April 1, [App. to Cong. Globe, page 297,] Mr. WARNER of Georgia, said:—

"We have been told by those who advocate this line of policy, that they do not desire to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists; and yet it is their intention to prevent the extension of slavery, by excluding it from the common Territory. * * * It matters but little with me, whether a man takes my property outright, or restricts me in the enjoyment of it, so as to render it of but little or no value to me. * * * Slavery cannot be confined within certain specified limits without producing the destruction of both master and slave; it requires fresh lands. * * * If the slaveholding States should ever be so regardless of their rights, and their power, as co-equal States, to be willing to submit to this proposed restriction, * * * they could not do it. * * * They OUGHT NOT to submit to it upon principle, if they could, and COULD NOT IF THEY WOULD."

It is in view of these things, sir, that the people of Georgia have assembled in Convention, and SOLEMNLY RESOLVED that, if Congress shall pass a law excluding them from the common property, with their slave property, they will DISRUPT THE TIES THAT BIND THEM TO THE UNION. This position has not been taken by way of threat or menace. Georgia never threatens, but Georgia always ACTS."

In the House, April 4, [App. to Cong. Globe, page 351,] Mr. SMITH of Tennessee, said:

"In my humble judgment, we should first look to the preservation of the Constitution of the United States; secondly, to the protection of the rights of the States; and, thirdly, to the preservation of the Federal Union. * * * So far as I am concerned, after the preservation of the rights of the States, which I, as an individual, or as a Representative, will never agree to see infringed, the next most important object which ought to actuate every patriot of this land is the preservation of the Union. * * * I believe that it [the Wilmot Proviso] is unconstitutional, unjust, and wrong. * * * Unless the South can unite and defend these men of the North, who stand by the guarantees of the Constitution, for the rights of the States, THE UNION IS GONE. * * * In the struggle which is soon to come off—a struggle on the issue of which are suspended the mighty doctrines of this nation—yes, sir, in my humble opinion, THE VERY EXISTENCE OF THIS UNION, the true hearted, conservative, and patriotic men of the whole country, * * * will stand bravely together around the broad banner of the democratic party."

In the House, January 9, [App. to Cong. Globe, page 54,] Mr. BOWIE of Maryland, said:

"They [the Republicans] say they are not Abolitionists, because, forsooth, they are not for interfering with slavery in the States. Why, sir, did you ever see or hear of a fanatic who was fanatical enough to go to that extent? They are called Abolitionists, and justly so, because they advocate the power of Congress to abolish Slavery in the Territories of the Union and in the District of Columbia. * * * There is a majority here in favor of the principles of non-intervention of Congress on the subject of domestic slavery in the Territories. That majority ought to be brought together in some mode of conciliation; for it must be admitted that no other question is half so VITAL TO THE PRESERVATION OF THE UNION. * * * These are interesting questions, [relating to the naturalization laws] to be sure, but they strike no chord in our hearts which vibrates with sounds of national disunion. They bring no tears to the eyes of the patriot, when brooding over the BROKEN FRAGMENTS OF A RUINED COUNTRY. * * * But let this Congress attempt to strike down the Constitutional rights of the South, then you and I and all of us WILL STRIKE, though bloody treason flourish over us."

In the House, April 7, Mr. KEITT, of South Carolina, said:

"Sir, the next contest will be a momentous one. It will turn up the question of Slavery, and the

constitutional rights of the South. The South should establish in the platform, the principle, that the right of a southern man to his slave is equal, in its length and breadth, to the right of a northern man to his horse. She should make the recognition of the right FULL, COMPLETE, and INDISPUTABLE. * * * * * Let the North refuse admission to a State because of slavery in her constitution, and the HISTORY OF THIS UNION IS CLOSED. * * * * *

If it [the government] becomes the puppet of Abolitionism, if it becomes, in our very midst, to us, a *foreign Government*, the South will TEAR IT DOWN from turret to foundation stone. Abolish the inter-State slave trade, and we will TRAMPLE your usurpations UNDER FOOT. Repeal the fugitive slave law, and the South will MEET YOU WITH GAUNTLETS ON. In the next presidential election the North will decide the *probable fate of the Union*. If the banner of Black Republicanism is lifted to victory, the South will raise aloft her symbol of sovereignty, and interpose her own shield for the safety of her citizens. LET THE CONSERVATIVES OF THE NORTH BEWARE!"

In the House, April 9, Hon. E. S. SHORTER of Alabama, said :

"Do you believe that the South, less patriotic now than in the days of the Revolution, will quietly submit to the sacrifice of her rights, and STILL CLING TO THE UNION? If such is public opinion at the North, let it be at once undeceived. We understand, gentlemen, what our rights are under the Constitution, and with the blessing of God we mean to maintain them. *We ask for nothing more—will be content with nothing less.*"

I hope and pray God that my section of the Union may never again, in an evil hour, be inclined to "compromise" with the North on the subject of slavery.

I believe in the right of a sovereign State to secede from the Union whenever she determines that the Federal Constitution has been violated by Congress; and that this Government has no constitutional power to coerce such seceding State.

I think South Carolina mistook her remedy—*secession* and not *nullification* ought to have been her watch-word.

The extraordinary exertions made by Massachusetts and the Black Republican party of the North, to rob the South of her equal rights in the Territories, has had one effect. You have thoroughly aroused the southern States to a sense of their danger. You have caused them COOLLY TO ESTIMATE THE VALUE OF THE UNION; and we are determined to maintain our EQUALITY IN IT, OR INDEPENDENCE OUT OF IT.

The South has planted itself where it intends to stand or fall, UNION OR NO UNION, and that is, upon the platform laid down by the Georgia convention.

We tell you plainly that we take issue with you; and whenever you repeal the fugitive slave law, OR refuse to admit a State on account of slavery in her constitution, OR our equality in the Territories is sacrificed by an act of Congress, *then* the star of this Union will go down to RISE NO MORE.

Should we be forced to DISSOLVE THE UNION in order to preserve southern institutions and southern civilization, we will do it in *peace*, if we can; IN WAR, IF WE MUST; and let the GOD OF BATTLES decide between us.

The shadows, sir, of the COMING STORM already darken our pathway. It will soon be upon us WITH ALL ITS FURY."

The reader who has patiently waded through all this "*damnable iteration*" of passion and treason, deserves something by way of episode and relief. A short farce after a tragedy, removes disagreeable impressions.

The reader may therefore, if he pleases, look at the following, selected at random from a vast deal of the same kind, uttered by Southern gentlemen in reference to Mr. Banks:—

On the 15th of December, in the House, [Cong. Globe, page 43.] Gov. SMITH, of Virginia, said :

"Did he [Mr. Banks] not declare, that under certain circumstances, he was willing to let the Union slide? I remember to have read, with SURPRISE, in the papers, during the summer, such a statement of his position. I read it also with a feeling of INDIGNATION, that one so gifted, and one so worthy, in many respects, should be so FALSE TO HIS ALLEGIANCE TO HIS COUNTRY."

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 464 422 5

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 464 422 5

Hollinger Corp.
pH 8.5